Regional Solid Waste System: Preparing for the Future South & West Sides

PORTLAN

Metro Council Work Session October 15, 2019

NUU A



## **Preparing for the Future**

The Council's Six Desired Outcomes and Regional Waste Plan serve as guides:

- The future is not entirely about garbage but also about jobs, equitable access, health, environment, GHG reduction, improved recycling, resilience, and public services
- Metro serves as the regional planning and overseer of the regional solid waste system



# Regional Priority Outcome Areas = RWP Vision & Goals







### **Current situation at MSS:**

- 30 year old facility not meeting current needs.
- Mix of commercial, business and residential users.
- Nearly 300K customers and growing -- 3%+ growth.
- Requires large number of staff to control traffic and check loads
- Safety concerns; long wait times.
- Not enough space or capacity to add other needed services e.g. food processing, Styrofoam, recycling, etc.



### **Objectives/Outcomes:**

- Improve customer/staff safety at MSS.
- Expand and improve public and commercial services.
- Expand recycling and recovery.
- Add food reload & pre-processing capacity.

### **Scenarios:**

- 1. <u>Move public self-haul</u> to another location; reconfigure MSS for commercial and food reload and pre-processing
- 2. <u>Move commercial services</u> to another location; redevelop MSS for public services
- 3. <u>Move all services</u> to another location and build full service modern transfer station; repurpose MSS

Scenarios	<b>Opportunities</b>	Challenges
Move public self-haul *Estimated cost \$80-\$120M	<ul> <li>Least cost option</li> <li>Repurpose South for food/commercial</li> <li>New community services</li> <li>Better safety and improved access</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Difficult to find a suitable site</li> <li>Public familiar with current site</li> <li>Traffic impacts moving 200,000+ vehicle trips to a new spot</li> </ul>
Move commercial services *Estimated cost \$140-\$180M	<ul> <li>Easier to relocate and site for 34,000 commercial trips</li> <li>Retains self-haul at "known" current location</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Highest cost option</li> <li>Reconfiguration of current MSS for public may be more difficult</li> </ul>
Move both and repurpose current South *Estimated cost \$100-\$130M	<ul> <li>Modern facility can address all users</li> <li>Education services could benefit all users</li> <li>Load compaction optimized</li> <li>Co-locating more efficient for staffing, management, and operations</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Moving 300,000 vehicle trips to new location</li> <li>Large project to design, permit, and build</li> <li>Need a larger site than other options</li> </ul>

### **Staff recommended option (Scenario 1):**

- <u>Stay flexible to pivot</u> if land acquisition opportunity (location, acreage, access, zoning) suits a different scenario
- <u>Move public self haul</u> to another location; reconfigure MSS for commercial and food
  - Relocate and improve self-haul, household hazardous waste, and recycling services; add community amenities and on-site education
  - Retrofit MSS to improve commercial hauler services and add commercial food waste reloading and processing

### Secure project site by Summer 2020

#### **Phasing of Staff Recommendation Option**



### Questions

1. Which scenario does Council prefer for the south side of the region?

### **Scenarios:**

- 1. Move public self-haul
- 2. Move commercial services
- 3. Move both and repurpose MSS

**Staff Recommendation:** remain flexible, but stay the course and plan to move self haul.

### **Current situation:**

- No public services on the west side (recycling, HHW, solid waste, etc.)
- All services provided by private sector
- High and inconsistent disposal charges
- Closest landfill, Riverbend, not a disposal option in 2020
- No proximate food reload/processing capacity





### **Objectives/Outcomes:**

- Establish publicly provided services in west and expand access.
- Improve overall system resiliency.
- Add food collection/processing capacity in west.
- Expand recycling and recovery in west.





### **Scenarios:**

- 1. Site and build two new solid waste service facilities: one in <u>Cornelius and</u> <u>one in Hillsboro</u>.
- 2. Design and build one new solid waste service facility in <u>Cornelius</u>.
- 3. Design and build one new solid waste service facility in <u>Hillsboro</u>.

Scenarios	Opportunities	Challenges
Two new west side facilities (Cornelius & Hillsboro) *Estimated cost \$120-\$200M	<ul> <li>Locate services based on community needs and growth</li> <li>Local government support</li> <li>Possible public-public partnership</li> <li>Private partnership potential</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Most expensive option</li> <li>Higher investment for staffing/management/operations</li> <li>Longer planning/construction horizon</li> <li>Site prioritization/sequence</li> </ul>
One new west side facility (Cornelius) *Estimated cost \$60-\$100M	<ul> <li>Shovel ready</li> <li>Located in industrial park area</li> <li>Fast track for permitting, design and construction</li> <li>Local government support</li> <li>Supports future growth</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Located farther out in the region</li> <li>Modest wetland mitigation required</li> <li>Future of FGTS unclear</li> </ul>
One new west side facility (Hillsboro) *Estimated cost \$60-\$100M	<ul> <li>Public-Public and/or Public-Private partnership</li> <li>Connection to trail/park system</li> <li>Adjacent to existing landfill/MRF</li> <li>Local government support</li> <li>Near a dry waste landfill</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Potential for long land use process</li> <li>Adjacent to residential neighborhoods and near two schools</li> <li>Potential traffic concerns</li> <li>Local government's vision for parcel needs further clarification</li> </ul>

\*Preliminary cost estimates (low confidence)

### **Staff recommended option (Scenario 1):**

- Secure and evaluate both sites.
  - <u>Cornelius:</u> Conduct due diligence and community engagement over next 12 months.
  - <u>Hillsboro</u>: Evaluate site and pursue land use designation change.
- Hire an engineering firm to <u>design a flexible facility template</u> that could accommodate a mix of garbage and recycling services, including new community services, at each site.
- Work closely with local elected leaders, community groups and other stakeholders to <u>determine the best suite of services</u> and build sequence.

### Phasing of Staff Recommended Option



### Questions

- 1. Should Metro focus on one or two sites on the west side?
- 2. If Council prefers one site, which site is preferable?

### Scenarios:

- 1. Two new west side facilities (Cornelius and Hillsboro)
- 2. One new west side facility in Cornelius.
- 3. One new west side facility in Hillsboro.

**Staff Recommendation:** continue with Cornelius due diligence and engagement, further explore Hillsboro opportunity.

### **NEXT STEPS**

- 1. Finalize and share HDR findings/cost estimates for moving commercial, and rebuilding MSS for self haul only
- 2. Continue work with local government electeds and staff throughout process (Both).
- 3. Form a Community Advisory Group(South), and hire CBOs to assist with community involvement(Both).
- 4. Bring critical decision points to Council (Both).
- 5. Upcoming Council work sessions: Food Waste (10/29); Rate Transparency (11/19); Recycling Public-Private Partnerships (12/3).